PATHOLOGY, MALEVOLENCE, AND CRIMINAL LIABILITY: A DYNAMIC FRAMEWORK FOR FORENSIC DIFFERENTIATION

Sergio Pommier Gallo, PhD

ORCID: 0009-0000-7387-3943

ORCID Profile: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7387-3943

Web of Science ResearcherID: QDO-1840-2026

Web of Science Research Profile:
https://www.webofscience.com/wos/author/record/QDO-1840-2026

Academic Blog: https://sergiopommiergallophd.blogspot.com/

Abstract

One of the most persistent challenges in criminal law, forensic psychiatry, and criminology concerns the distinction between pathological conduct and malevolent conduct. Contemporary criminal justice systems frequently confront offenders whose actions emerge from complex interactions among mental disorders, personality structures, environmental influences, cognitive processes, and intentional decision-making. Traditional legal frameworks often rely upon binary distinctions between sanity and insanity, responsibility and non-responsibility, or pathology and intentional wrongdoing. However, such dichotomies increasingly fail to capture the complexity of contemporary criminal behavior. This paper introduces a dynamic framework derived from the Latent Dynamics Model (LDM) to reassess the relationship between pathology, malevolence, and criminal liability. Through doctrinal analysis integrating criminal law, criminology, forensic psychology, neurocriminology, and behavioral sciences, the study argues that pathology and malevolence should not be understood as mutually exclusive categories but as interacting dimensions capable of influencing criminal conduct simultaneously. The findings suggest that criminal responsibility assessments should move beyond rigid categorical approaches and adopt dynamic evaluative models capable of capturing the evolving nature of human behavior. The paper concludes that the Latent Dynamics Model provides a more nuanced framework

for differentiating pathological influences from intentional malevolent conduct while preserving the normative foundations of criminal liability.

Keywords: criminal liability; pathology; malevolence; forensic criminology; criminal responsibility; Latent Dynamics Model; forensic psychiatry; neurocriminology; mens rea; criminal law.

1. Introduction

The distinction between pathology and malevolence has long occupied a central position in criminal law and criminological theory. Courts routinely confront cases involving offenders whose conduct appears influenced by mental illness, personality disorders, neurological impairments, or psychological dysfunction. Simultaneously, legal systems maintain the principle that individuals capable of rational decision-making remain responsible for intentional criminal conduct.

This distinction is not merely theoretical. It directly influences determinations regarding culpability, sentencing, treatment, confinement, and public safety. The challenge emerges when pathology and intentional wrongdoing coexist within the same behavioral framework.

Traditional legal doctrine frequently approaches the issue through binary classifications. Offenders are often categorized as either mentally impaired or fully responsible. Such classifications, while administratively useful, frequently fail to reflect the complexity observed in contemporary forensic practice.

Modern criminology increasingly recognizes that criminal behavior emerges through multidimensional interactions involving biological, psychological, social, environmental, and technological influences. Consequently, simplistic distinctions between pathology and malevolence may obscure the mechanisms that actually contribute to criminal conduct.

Research Question: Can criminal liability be more accurately assessed through a dynamic framework that treats pathology and malevolence as interacting dimensions rather than mutually exclusive categories?

Hypothesis (H1): Pathology and malevolence frequently coexist within criminal behavior, and criminal responsibility assessments become more accurate when evaluated through dynamic interaction models rather than rigid categorical distinctions.

2. Theoretical Framework

The Latent Dynamics Model provides the conceptual foundation for this analysis.

Traditional criminal law generally assumes that pathology reduces responsibility while intentional malevolence increases culpability. This assumption reflects a linear understanding of criminal behavior.

However, contemporary criminological research suggests that pathology and intentionality frequently overlap. Certain offenders may suffer from identifiable psychological disturbances while simultaneously demonstrating strategic planning, awareness of consequences, and purposeful decision-making.

The Latent Dynamics Model conceptualizes criminal behavior as the product of interacting variables rather than isolated causes. Within this framework, pathology represents one dynamic influence among many possible influences affecting behavioral outcomes.

Malevolence is defined not as a psychological diagnosis but as the conscious willingness to inflict harm, exploit vulnerability, violate legal norms, or pursue antisocial objectives despite awareness of their consequences.

The model proposes four possible interaction patterns:

Type I: Predominantly Pathological Conduct.

Type II: Pathology-Influenced Malevolence.

Type III: Malevolence with Limited Pathological Influence.

Type IV: Predominantly Malevolent Conduct.

These categories are not static. Individuals may transition between them over time as circumstances, psychological conditions, and environmental factors evolve.

3. Methodology

This study employs qualitative doctrinal analysis supported by comparative criminological and forensic scholarship.

Sources include:

• criminal law doctrine

• forensic psychiatry literature

• neurocriminological research

• behavioral science studies

• criminal responsibility theory

• forensic risk assessment models

Analytical variables include:

• pathology

• malevolence

• criminal intent

• behavioral regulation

• cognitive functioning

• culpability

• risk assessment

• responsibility attribution

The objective is to develop a theoretical framework capable of improving criminal responsibility assessments without undermining legal accountability.

4. Results

The analysis identifies five principal findings.

4.1 Pathology Does Not Automatically Eliminate Responsibility

The presence of mental illness does not necessarily negate criminal liability.

Many offenders diagnosed with psychiatric conditions retain substantial capacities for planning, understanding consequences, and exercising behavioral control.

The findings demonstrate that pathology and responsibility frequently coexist.

4.2 Malevolence Cannot Be Reduced to Mental Disorder

A significant number of serious offenders display intentional harmful conduct without evidence of major psychopathology.

The tendency to pathologize all extreme criminality risks obscuring the role of conscious decision-making in criminal behavior.

4.3 Hybrid Behavioral Profiles Are Common

The research indicates that many offenders occupy intermediate positions between pathology and malevolence.

Behavior frequently emerges through interactions involving psychological dysfunction, environmental pressures, learned behaviors, personal motivations, and rational calculation.

These hybrid profiles challenge traditional legal classifications.

4.4 Dynamic Assessment Improves Forensic Accuracy

Static diagnostic approaches often fail to capture behavioral evolution.

Dynamic assessment models allow evaluators to examine how pathology, cognition, social context, and intentionality interact over time.

This produces more accurate evaluations of criminal responsibility.

4.5 The Latent Dynamics Model Enhances Responsibility Analysis

The Latent Dynamics Model provides a framework capable of integrating diverse criminological and forensic variables without abandoning normative legal principles.

Rather than replacing existing doctrines, the model supplements them by offering greater explanatory depth.

5. Discussion

The findings support the hypothesis that criminal behavior cannot be adequately understood through rigid distinctions between pathology and malevolence.

Traditional legal systems developed within intellectual environments characterized by relatively limited understanding of behavioral complexity. Advances in neuroscience, psychology, and criminology now reveal a far more dynamic picture.

Importantly, recognition of complexity does not imply reduced accountability.

The Latent Dynamics Model rejects deterministic interpretations that attribute criminal conduct exclusively to pathology. At the same time, it rejects simplistic assumptions that all criminal behavior reflects purely autonomous choice.

Instead, the model recognizes that responsibility emerges within dynamic behavioral systems.

This approach has significant implications for criminal justice policy. Sentencing decisions, forensic evaluations, risk assessments, rehabilitation strategies, and preventive interventions may all benefit from frameworks capable of recognizing interactions between pathology and malevolence.

The distinction is particularly important in cases involving extreme violence, serial offending, organized criminality, terrorism, cybercrime, and predatory victimization, where traditional categories frequently prove inadequate.

By conceptualizing pathology and malevolence as interacting dimensions rather than opposing categories, the model offers a more realistic account of contemporary criminal behavior.

6. Conclusions

The relationship between pathology and malevolence represents one of the most complex challenges in criminal responsibility theory.

Traditional binary approaches often fail to capture the multidimensional realities of criminal conduct observed in modern forensic practice.

This paper argues that pathology and malevolence should be understood as dynamic and potentially overlapping influences rather than mutually exclusive explanations for criminal behavior.

The Latent Dynamics Model provides a framework capable of integrating psychological, criminological, neurological, and legal perspectives while preserving the normative foundations of criminal liability.

Future research should continue exploring dynamic approaches to responsibility assessment, particularly in cases involving complex interactions among mental health conditions, environmental influences, cognitive processes, and intentional harmful conduct.

A dynamic understanding of pathology and malevolence may ultimately contribute to more accurate, equitable, and scientifically informed criminal justice systems.

References

Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2017). The Psychology of Criminal Conduct. Routledge.

Duff, R. A. (2007). Answering for Crime: Responsibility and Liability in the Criminal Law. Hart Publishing.

Hare, R. D. (1999). Without Conscience: The Disturbing World of the Psychopaths Among Us. Guilford Press.

Hart, H. L. A. (2008). Punishment and Responsibility: Essays in the Philosophy of Law. Oxford University Press.

Meloy, J. R. (2018). The Psychopathic Mind: Origins, Dynamics, and Treatment. Routledge.

Morse, S. J. (2013). Brain overclaim syndrome and criminal responsibility. Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law, 3(2), 397–412.

Raine, A. (2013). The Anatomy of Violence: The Biological Roots of Crime. Pantheon Books.

Samenow, S. E. (2014). Inside the Criminal Mind. Crown Publishing.

Walsh, A., & Beaver, K. M. (2009). Biosocial Criminology: New Directions in Theory and Research. Routledge.

Yakeley, J., & Adshead, G. (2013). Personality disorder and serious offending. Psychiatry, 12(6), 243–247.